



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/736,167	12/15/2000	Douglas Jakubowski	003636.0088	8095

7590 01/28/2005

Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
Attn: William H. Boliman
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20016

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/736,167

Applicant(s)

JAKUBOWSKI, DOUGLAS

Examiner

Peter J Smith

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-98 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-98 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 10/12/2004.
2. Claims 1-98 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 20, 24, 30, 42, 44, 47, 51, 54, 60, 72, 76, 82, and 95 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 4-6, 24, 27-29, 44, 46, 54, 57-59, 76, and 79-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwerdtfeger et al. (hereinafter "Schwerdtfeger"), US 6,725,424 B1 filed 12/9/1999 in view of Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen"), US 6,668,354 B1 filed 6/5/1999.**

Regarding independent claims 1, 24, 44, 54, and 76, Schwerdtfeger teaches requesting from a mobile device, a request to display a source page, transcoding the content of a portion of the source page into a destination page according to transformation information for manipulating the content based on capabilities of the mobile device, and transmitting the destination page to a client mobile device in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. Schwerdtfeger does not teach generating and using a stylesheet containing transformation information indicating content to be extracted from the source page and transformed into the destination page. Chen does teach generating and using a stylesheet containing transformation information

Art Unit: 2176

indicating content to be extracted from the source page and transformed into the destination page in col. 1 line 35 – col. 2 line 35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the stylesheet generation of Chen to have implemented the transcoding taught by Schwerdtfeger so that the transcoding of the source to destination page could have been automatically adaptable to the content contained in the source page.

Regarding dependent claims 4, 27, 46, 57, and 79, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach receiving and storing to a site mining template the information indicating the content to be extracted and the transformation information for manipulating the content and then using the template to produce a stylesheet. Chen does teach using a template containing information indicating content to be extracted and the transformation information for manipulating the content and then using the template to produce a stylesheet in col. 1 line 35 – col. 2 line 35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have placed the identified portion and the content transformation of Schwerdtfeger into the template of Chen so that a stylesheet could have been

Art Unit: 2176

produced to have transcoded XML documents into a form which would have been able to have been displayed on the client computing device.

Regarding dependent claims 5-6, 28-29, 58-59, and 80-81, Schwerdtfeger teaches transcoding source pages comprising XML or HTML documents in the abstract.

5. Claims 2-3, 7-19, 25-26, 30-41, 45, 47-50, 55-56, 60-71, 77-78, and 82-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwerdtfeger et al. (hereinafter “Schwerdtfeger”), US 6,725,424 B1 filed 12/9/1999 in view of Chen et al. (hereinafter “Chen”), US 6,668,354 B1 filed 6/5/1999 as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Fong et al. (hereinafter “Fong”), US 6,279,015 B1 filed 12/23/1997.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 25, 55, and 77, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach that the user may designate a portion of the page to form a site mining expression to identify the content to be extracted from the source page. Fong does teach providing a client user with a tool for identifying content in a source page to be transformed into a destination page, thus forming a site mining expression in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 45 – col. 4 line 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Fong into Schwerdtfeger in view of Chen to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the graphical user interface of Fong to have selected only a subset of the source page for transcoding and presentation to the user of the client device.

Regarding dependent claims 3, 26, 45, 56, and 78, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach that the user may uniquely designate a portion of the page to form a site mining expression to identify the content to be extracted from the source page. Fong does teach providing a client user with a tool for uniquely identifying content in a source page to be transformed into a destination page, thus forming a site mining expression in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 45 – col. 4 line 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Fong into Schwerdtfeger in view of Chen to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the graphical user interface of Fong to have selected only a subset of the source page for transcoding and presentation to the user of the client device.

Regarding dependent claims 7, 30, 47, 60, and 82, Schwerdtfeger teaches receiving an indication of an item of content to be extracted from a source page containing one or more items of content and receiving transformation information for manipulating the item of content in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach that the user may uniquely designate a portion of the page to form a site mining expression to identify the content to be extracted from the source page. Fong does teach providing a client user with a tool for uniquely identifying content in a source page to be transformed into a destination page, thus forming a site mining expression in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 45 – col. 4 line 10. Schwerdtfeger also does not specifically teach receiving and storing to a site mining template the information indicating the content to be extracted and the transformation

Art Unit: 2176

information for manipulating the content and then using the template to produce a stylesheet.

Chen does teach using a template containing information indicating content to be extracted and the transformation information for manipulating the content and then using the template to produce a stylesheet in col. 1 line 35 – col. 2 line 35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have placed the identified portion and the content transformation of Schwerdtfeger into the template of Chen so that a stylesheet could have been produced to have transcoded XML documents into a form which would have been able to have been displayed on the client computing device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Fong into Schwerdtfeger in view of Chen to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the graphical user interface of Fong to have selected only a subset of the source tree for transcoding and presentation to the user of the client device.

Regarding dependent claims 8 and 83, Schwerdtfeger teaches transcoding a source document to a destination document, but does not teach doing so using a stylesheet and thus does not teach receiving format information for formatting a layout of the stylesheet. Chen does teach receiving format information for formatting a layout of the stylesheet and storing the formation information to the template in col. 1 line 35 – col. 2 line 35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It

Art Unit: 2176

would have been obvious and desirable to have used the stylesheets of Chen to have improved Schwerdtfeger so that the to source documents could have been transcoded more efficiently.

Regarding dependent claims 9, 31, 61, and 84, Schwerdtfeger teaches an interface receiving an indication of a source page, retrieving the source page and transcoding the source page or a portion of the source page into a destination page in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach displaying one or more items of content contained in the source page for allowing a selection of the content to be extracted. Fong does teach displaying one or more items of content contained in the source page for allowing a selection of the content to be extracted in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 45 – col. 4 line 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Fong into Schwerdtfeger in view of Chen to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the graphical user interface of Fong to have selected only a subset of the source page for transcoding and presentation to the user of the client device.

Regarding dependent claims 10, 32, 62, and 85, Schwerdtfeger teaches transcoding a source document into a destination document, but does not teach doing so using a stylesheet and thus does not teach that the transformation information includes procedural tags for controlling a processing routine in the stylesheet. Chen does teach that the transformation information includes procedural tags for controlling a processing routine in the stylesheet in col. 1 line 35 – col. 2 line 35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It

Art Unit: 2176

would have been obvious and desirable to have used the stylesheets of Chen to have improved Schwerdtfeger so that the to source documents could have been transcoded more efficiently.

Regarding dependent claims 11, 33, 48, 63, and 86, Schwerdtfeger teaches transcoding a source document into a destination document, but does not teach doing so using a stylesheet and thus does not teach that the transformation information includes procedural tags for controlling a processing routine in the stylesheet. Chen does teach that the transformation information includes procedural tags for controlling a processing routine in the stylesheet in col. 1 line 35 – col. 2 line 35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the stylesheets of Chen to have improved Schwerdtfeger so that the to source documents could have been transcoded more efficiently.

Regarding dependent claims 12, 34, 64, and 87, Schwerdtfeger teaches that the source page is an HTML or XML document in the abstract, which has content delineated by one or more tags. Fong further illustrates an item of content being delineated by one or more tags in fig. 7.

Regarding dependent claims 13, 35, 65, and 88, Schwerdtfeger teaches transcoding a source document into a destination document, but does not teach doing so using a stylesheet and thus does not teach compiling a template with a two pass compilation process, wherein a first pass generates a main body of the stylesheet and a second pass generates commands located outside of the main body. Chen does teach creation of a template to further create a stylesheet for transcoding the source page into a destination page in col. 1 line 35 – col. 2 line 35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used a two pass compilation process so that both the main body of the stylesheet and commands outside the main body could have been created.

Regarding dependent claims 14, 36, 49, 66, and 89, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach receiving filtering criteria for indicating content to be extracted, wherein the criteria includes at least one of: selecting a single item of content located at a particular position, siblings of the item of content, similarly named siblings of the item of content, similarly named items of content located anywhere within the source page, and content containing specific text. Fong does teach receiving filtering criteria for indicating content to be extracted, wherein the criteria includes at least one of: selecting a single item of content located at a particular position, siblings of the item of content, similarly named siblings of the item of content, similarly named items of content located anywhere within the source page, and content containing specific text in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 45 – col. 4 line 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Fong into Schwerdtfeger in view of Chen to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the graphical user interface of Fong to have selected only a subset of the source page for transcoding and presentation to the user of the client device.

Regarding dependent claims 15, 37, 50, 67, and 90, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be

Art Unit: 2176

transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach receiving an indication of a root element and displaying content stemming from the root element, wherein the content to be extracted is selected from the item of content stemming from the root element and wherein the expression is determined by combining an expression locating the root element with an expression locating the selected content relative to the root element.

Fong does teach receiving an indication of a root element and displaying content stemming from the root element, wherein the content to be extracted is selected from the item of content stemming from the root element and wherein the expression is determined by combining an expression locating the root element with an expression locating the selected content relative to the root element in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 45 – col. 4 line 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Fong into Schwerdtfeger in view of Chen to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the graphical user interface of Fong to have selected only a subset of the source page for transcoding and presentation to the user of the client device.

Regarding dependent claims 16-17, 38-39, 68-69, and 91-92, Schwerdtfeger teaches transcoding source pages comprising XML or HTML documents in the abstract.

Regarding dependent claims 18, 40, 70, and 93, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. Schwerdtfeger does not teach wherein the expression comprises an XPath expression. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Schwerdtfeger in

Art Unit: 2176

view of Chen and Fong to have used an XPath expression so that it would have been easy to have identified which content was to have been transformed by the stylesheet.

Regarding dependent claims 19, 41, 71, and 94, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not teach using an XSLT stylesheet. Chen teaches using an XSLT stylesheet in col. 1 lines 13-16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chen into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used XSLT to have transcoded the source page because it is the best transformation for XML documents.

6. Claims 20-23, 42-43, 51-53, 72-75, 95-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwerdtfeger et al. (hereinafter “Schwerdtfeger”), US 6,725,424 B1 filed 12/9/1999 in view of Fong et al. (hereinafter “Fong”), US 6,279,015 B1 filed 12/23/1997.

Regarding dependent claims 20, 42, 51, 72, and 95, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transcoded into a destination page and transmitted to a client in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach how the portion is determined and thus does not teach displaying a plurality of content items on a graphical user interface, receiving a selection for an item of content, displaying any graphical components of the one item of content selected, and generating a site mining expression for locating the one item of content

Art Unit: 2176

in the source page, wherein the site mining expression is capable of locating content in a document written in extensible markup language.

Fong teaches displaying a plurality of content items on a graphical user interface, receiving a selection for an item of content, displaying any graphical components of the one item of content selected, and generating a site mining expression for locating the one item of content in the source page, wherein the site mining expression is capable of locating content in a document in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 45 – col. 4 line 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Fong into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the graphical user interface of Fong to have implemented the content selection and transcoding of Schwerdtfeger to have created a site mining expression which would have been used to have been capable of locating content in a document written in an extensible markup language. The resulting content transcoding would have been a transformation of content desired by the user of the client computer system.

Regarding dependent claims 21, 43, 73, and 96, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. Schwerdtfeger does not teach wherein the expression comprises an XPath expression. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Schwerdtfeger in view of Fong to have used an XPath expression so that it would have been easy to have identified which content was to have been transformed by the stylesheet.

Regarding dependent claims 22, 52, 74, and 97, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach receiving filtering criteria for indicating content to be extracted, wherein the criteria includes at least one of: selecting a single item of content located at a particular position, siblings of the item of content, similarly named siblings of the item of content, similarly named items of content located anywhere within the source page, and content containing specific text. Fong does teach receiving filtering criteria for indicating content to be extracted, wherein the criteria includes at least one of: selecting a single item of content located at a particular position, siblings of the item of content, similarly named siblings of the item of content, similarly named items of content located anywhere within the source page, and content containing specific text in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 45 – col. 4 line 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Fong into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the graphical user interface of Fong to have selected only a subset of the source page for transcoding and presentation to the user of the client device.

Regarding dependent claims 23, 53, 75, and 98, Schwerdtfeger teaches retrieving a source page from a web server and identifying a portion of the content of the source page to be transformed in fig. 1-5, col. 1 lines 36-67, col. 3 line 10 – col. 5 line 31. However, Schwerdtfeger does not specifically teach receiving an indication of a root element and displaying content stemming from the root element, wherein the content to be extracted is selected from the item of content stemming from the root element and wherein the expression is

determined by combining an expression locating the root element with an expression locating the selected content relative to the root element.

Fong does teach receiving an indication of a root element and displaying content stemming from the root element, wherein the content to be extracted is selected from the item of content stemming from the root element and wherein the expression is determined by combining an expression locating the root element with an expression locating the selected content relative to the root element in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 45 – col. 4 line 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Fong into Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the graphical user interface of Fong to have selected only a subset of the source page for transcoding and presentation to the user of the client device.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/12/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's argument in pages 28 and 29 that the teachings of Schwerdtfeger et al. (hereinafter "Schwerdtfeger") and Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen") are unrelated art and nonsensical to combine, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Transcoding and transformation by use of stylesheets are related with transcoding be the more general of the two terms. Schwerdtfeger implements the transcoding by creating a modification script to translate the HTML, XML, or other format source document into an appropriately formatted document for the client mobile device. Chen teaches in col. 1 lines 25-31 that the motivation for the invention is to automate the generation of display scripts and style sheets. Therefore, Chen has knowledge

Art Unit: 2176

of transcoding the display format of an electronic document with both display scripts and style sheets, whereas the Examiner has admits that Schwerdtfeger only explicitly teaches the use of a modification, or display, script. Because Chen provides for creating both display scripts and style sheets, the Examiner believes these teachings to be an obvious enhancement upon the teachings of Schwerdtfeger by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding Applicant's argument in pages 29-31 that Fong et al. (hereinafter "Fong") does not teach generating a site mining expression, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Fong does teach a graphical user interface whereby a user may select one or more graphical content items so that the content items may be located and transcoded. The term mining in its broadest reasonable interpretation by the Examiner means selection of content and it appears to the Examiner that the claims are using the term mining in this way. The claims require a graphical user interface displaying a plurality of content items in a tree view, receiving a selection for one of the content items to be extracted from the source page, and then generating a site mining expression for locating the one item of content in the source page, wherein the site mining expression is capable of locating content in the document written in an extensible markup language. The Examiner believes Fong satisfies these requirements of the claimed invention and while and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Fong and Schwerdtfeger to have created the claimed invention. Schwerdtfeger teaches selecting and transforming only a portion of the source document, but does not specifically teach how that portion is determined. Fong provides the teaching of using a graphical user interface to determine a what portion of a source document should be transformed.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
1/26/2005


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER